

## Slide 1 Introduction

STARS-FL Major Command Conference  
PACFLT Problem Disbursements

Dennis Mizuo  
Head, Finance & Accounting Branch  
CINCPACFLT  
808-474-7868  
[Mizuodt@cpf.navy.mil](mailto:Mizuodt@cpf.navy.mil)

## Slide 2 Outline

Situation A Few Years Ago

FY 01 UMD Reduction Goals

FY 01 UMD Performance Chart

Major Problem Areas Causing UMDs

Required Actions

### Slide 3 Past Performance CPF Claimant OM&N Unmatched Disbursements

The following line graph shows the past performance CPF claimant OM&N unmatched disbursements (UMDs) from December 1997 through March 2001. The graph shows an increase in unmatched disbursements from December 1997 to March 1998, rising from approximately \$230 million to \$235 million. From March 1998 through March 2000, unmatched disbursements experience a downward trend.

For June 1988, there were approximately \$75 million UMDs, for September 1998 \$150 million UMDs, December 1998 \$150 million UMDs, March 1999 \$135 million UMDs, June 1999 \$110 million UMDs, September 1999 \$80 million UMDs, December 1999 \$75 million UMDs, March 2000 \$50 million UMDs.

There is a slight upward trend from March 2000 to June 2000 but in September 2000, unmatched disbursements reach a low of \$29.748 million. A slight rise from September 2000 to December 2000 and a slight drop from December 2000 to March 2001 follow.

#### Slide 4 ASN Assigned UMD Reduction Goals

The following table shows the ASN-Assigned UMD reduction goals for PACFLT. The table has 4 columns and 4 rows. The first column lists the fiscal year, the second column shows the net UMD reduction goals, the third column shows the percentage of PACFLT funds, and the fourth column shows the absolute UMD reduction goals.

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Net</b>	<b>% of Funds</b>	<b>Absolute</b>
FY 01	\$22.0M	.056%	\$22.5M
FY 02	\$19.3M	.049%	\$19.8M
FY 03	\$16.8M	.043%	\$17.3M

## Slide 5 Assigned FY01 UMD Reduction Goals

The following table shows the assigned fiscal year 2001 UMD reduction goals. The table has 4 columns and 12 rows. The first column lists the group name, the second column shows the net FY01 reduction goal, the third column lists the percentage of funds, and the fourth column shows the absolute FY01 reduction goal.

<b>Group</b>	<b>Net</b>	<b>Percentage of Funds</b>	<b>Absolute</b>
PACFLT CMOBS	\$3,547,000	.039%	\$3,577,000
CNAP	15,806,000	.143%	15,909,000
CNSP	602,000	.027%	834,000
CSP	757,000	.049%	788,000
COMTHIRD NCB	23,000	.011%	23,000
COMNAVREG SW SD	73,000	.002%	79,000
COMNAVREG NW SEATTLE	47,000	.002%	48,000
COMNAVREG PH	186,000	.011%	186,000
DIRECT REPORTERS	874,000	.013%	928,000
NAVMARSUPPACT GUAM	90,000	.014%	91,000
CNF JAPAN	41,000	.003%	41,000

## Slide 6 PACFLT UMD Comparison to Assigned “Net” Goals

The following bar chart shows the fiscal year 2001 net UMDs. The actual net UMDs and the goal net UMDs for September 2000 through September 2001 are shown for side-by-side comparison. Actual net UMDs are shown through March 2001.

For September 2000 both goal and actual net UMDs are \$30,000, for October 2000 the goal for UMDs is \$28 million and the actual is \$32 million for November 2000 the goal is \$27 million and the actual is \$36 million, for December 2000 the goal is \$26 million and actual is \$43 million, for January 2001 the goal is \$25 million and the actual is \$42 million, for February 2001 the goal is \$24.5 million and the actual is \$42 million, for March 2001 the goal is \$24 million and the actual is \$35 million, for April 2001 the goal is \$23.5 million, for May 2001 the goal is \$23 million, for June 2001 the goal is \$22.5 million, for July 2001 the goal is \$22 million, for August 2001 the goal is \$21.5 million, for September 2001 the goal is \$21 million. Note all UMD amounts are approximate.

## Slide 7 PACFLT UMD Comparison to “Absolute” Assigned Goals

The following bar chart shows the fiscal year 2001 absolute UMDs. The actual absolute UMDs and the goal absolute UMDs for September 2000 through September 2001 are shown for side-by-side comparison. Actual absolute UMDs are shown through March 2001.

For September 2000 both goal and actual absolute UMDs are \$30 million, for October 2000 the goal for UMDs is \$29 million and the actual is \$32 million, for November 2000 the goal is \$28.5 million and the actual is \$40 million, for December 2000 the goal is \$28 million and actual is \$46 million, for January 2001 the goal is \$27.5 million and the actual is \$42 million, for February 2001 the goal is \$27 million and the actual is \$45 million, for March 2001 the goal is \$26.5 million and the actual is \$35 million, for April 2001 the goal is \$26 million, for May 2001 the goal is \$25 million, for June 2001 the goal is \$24 million, for July 2001 the goal is \$23 million, for August 2001 the goal is \$22 million, for September 2001 the goal is \$21 million. Note all UMD amounts are approximate.

## Slide 8 Major Problem Areas Causing UMDs

- TL Processing Problems in SALTS and DMC
- Cross Disbursement Payments
- Travel Claims Processed by the PSDs
- OPAC Bills
- Erroneous Supply Transactions (Fund Code Errors)
- Items Transition from Free Material to Chargeable Material

### Speaker Notes:

TLS SUSPENDING IN SALTS—Problems were ongoing for approximately 4 months, processing problems due to SALTS, DMC/FMSO and/or manual process. Changes have been made which should eliminate problems experienced to date.

CROSS DISBURSEMENT PAYMENTS—Payments generated by Air Force, Army or a DAO, the SDN is seldom created or entered correctly. Backup documentation from a DAO is difficult to get because of they are not required to keep the backup.

TRAVEL CLAIMS PROCESSED BY THE PSDS—Numerous problems currently ongoing with PSD Bremerton and Pendleton, our research indicates that the Fleet line of accounting is often being entered without the suffix code of 0. In lieu of creating a “special,” somewhere the system seems to be automatic assigning a default suffix code. Since we are now getting a number of TAD fleet transactions on the Super OB 1960/57025C (where we previously saw them hitting 57025H), we assume that the default is choosing the first “alpha” character and assigning an erroneous suffix coded which drives the charges to the wrong AAA and OB. We have reviewed travel claims and the problem seems to be coming from the PSD.

OPAC BILLS—Appears the AF is using erroneous MIPR numbers making it hard to identify, getting backup is extremely difficult.

ERRONEOUS SUPPLY TRANSACTIONS (FUND CODE ERRORS)—Expenditures processing to the end user, which should be processing to the stock fund. (Being cited vice VZ, UZ, KZ etc).

ITEMS TRANSITION FROM FREE MATERIAL TO A CHARGABLE MATERIAL—A number of items migrate from being free material (Y6) to chargeable material, if an item was initially listed as “free” the unit has not obligated or reserved funds to cover. Units may not always know the item has migrated and/or since no funds were reserved initially, if when they do know there may be no funds available to allow the unit to obligate. If it occurs in a prior fiscal year the unit is no longer authorized to post new obligations against those prior fiscal year funds. 1960 frequently contains a number of transactions citing fund code Y6, which are still “free” issue and should not have posted to the end-use line of accounting.



## Slide 9 Major Problem Areas Causing UMDs (continued)

- Requisitioning Errors/Phone in Orders
- Air Force Fuel Errors
- R-Supply Conversions and/or AIS Problems
- Processing DD1131/Corrections Incorrectly by DFAS Cleveland
- Servmart Assigns Document Number Vice Citing Units Document Number
- DESC/NAVPET Transition to FAS (New Process Will Create UMDS for GSE Fuel)

### Speaker Notes:

REQUISITIONING ERRORS—Unit sites wrong information or fund code on initial requisition or the requisition is an urgent requirement and is phoned into the ICP vice being entered through the system and the unit fails to add the transaction to their AIS system.

AIR FORCE FUEL ERRORS—A large number of charges coming in with fund codes 78 vice 7B, and fund code 61 (which is the Air Force's fuel fund code). FAS may help alleviate this as long as the FC tables for each DODAAC are set correctly.

R-SUPPLY CONVERSIONS AND/OR AIS PROBLEMS—If a unit is converting to a new system, they cannot run batches of obligations for a period of time, however the business of running the MALS or the carrier cannot stop. Additionally, if a unit has an AIS problem they are often “dead in the water” until SPAWAR sends someone to assist and the problem is resolved.

### PROBLEMS WITH DFAS CLEVELAND PROCESSING DD1131/COLLECTIONS

INCORRECTLY—DFAS is not picking up the SDN as identified on the source document; instead the SDN field contains DFAS Cleveland's UIC, but posting to the FAA's 1960.

### SERVMART ASSIGNS DOCUMENT NUMBER VICE CITING UNITS DOCUMENT

NUMBER—The servmart assigns their own document numbers to the purchases vice using the doc number assigned by the servmart and entering servmarts doc number into their AIS system. Some OPTAR clerks at the unit level are still unaware of the servmart process for assignment of doc numbers. Additionally, not all servmarts operate the same way.

DESC/NAVPET TRANSITION TO FAS—Under FAS the system assigns an “ff” series document number when fuel is issued. OFC50 OPTAR holders charge mogas to fund code 7L, however the “ff” series document number cannot be entered into R-supply except as an “mvo” document. This forces us to do a workaround. Unfortunately UMDs will initially be created as the result of the expenditure processing via the IFB. Once the expenditure posts to the 1960, the FAA technician will change the document number of the expenditure to match the obligation document loaded in R-supply. Here we have a case of two new AIS systems (FAS and R-Supply) which are not flexible, and as the result, UMDs are created and additional manpower is necessary to perform workarounds.

#### Slide 10 REQUIRED ACTIONS

- Ensure obligations reported timely and accurately
- Develop a Partnership with your supporting DFAS OPLOC!

Slide 11 REQUIRED ACTIONS (continued)

Work-Missing/Insufficient Obligation Reports:

- IDA 128-Report of Obligation Deficiencies Local OPLOC
- IDA 129-Report of Obligation Deficiencies from other OPLOC
- Prevalidation Invalid Request Report (LXF3113B)

ASN acceptance/approval of CINCLANTFLT's 5 recommendations—letter of 13 Feb 01.

DFAS San Diego's assistance to reengineer obligations procedures for ships fuel phase II-fuel issued from Defense Fuel Support Points to PACFLT ships.

Identify and correct the source of the UMD problem.